

$\mathcal{PT}$ -Symmetric and non-Hermitian theories outside their Stokes Wedges

Abouzeid. M. Shalaby

Physics Department, Faculty of Science, Mansoura University, Egypt

Abstract

Based on the realization that, in $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric quantum mechanics, the analytic continuation of the eigen value problem into the complex plane is equivalent to the known canonical point transformation, we raise the question why then a theory selects some specific canonical transformations represented by contours within the Stokes wedges of the theory and rejects others represented by contours outside the Stokes wedges? To answer this question, we show that the transition amplitudes are the same either calculated within or out of the Stokes wedges but with related metric operators. To illustrate our idea, we reinvestigated the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric $-x^4$ theory by selecting a complex contour outside the Stokes wedges. Following orthogonal polynomials studies, we were able to reproduce exactly the same equivalent Hermitian Hamiltonian obtained before in the literature. Since the metric is implicit in algorithms employing the Heisenberg picture, we assert the importance of this trend for the research in $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric field theories. Regarding this, we select a simple Z_2 symmetry breaking contour, regardless of being inside or outside the Stokes wedges, to investigate the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric $-\phi^4$ field theory. We follow the famous effective action approach, up to two loops, to obtain very accurate results for the vacuum energy and vacuum condensate compared to previous calculations carried out for the equivalent Hermitian theory.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ca, 11.90.+t

Keywords: Pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonians, Metric Operators, Non-Hermitian models, $\mathcal{PT}$ -Symmetric theories, Stokes wedges.

The study of non-Hermitian theories of real spectra represents a current active research area [1–10]. The importance of these new studies is that it gives us the hope to find in these theories valuable applications as well as to introduce solutions to existing problems in nature. For instance, it has been found that the time of flight between two states can be arbitrarily short in Non-Hermitian theories which might have applications in Quantum computing [11]. Another manifestation of the importance of these theories is the ability of the associated tools to solve the ghost states problems in Lee-Wick theories [12–14] which plays a role in solving the Hierarchy problem in the standard model of elementary particle interactions.

The recipe for investigating a non-Hermitian theory of real spectrum is to make an analytic continuation of the eigen value problem represented by the Schrödinger equation;

$$H\psi = E\psi, \quad (1)$$

$$H = p^2 + V(ix), \quad (2)$$

into the complex plane [15]. Here ψ is the eigen function, H is the Hamiltonian operator, p the momentum operator, $V(ix)$ is the potential and x is the position operator. In this process, one replaces the original Hamiltonian operator H , which is an operator function in the position and momentum operators, by an operator of the form ($\hbar = 1$, $m = 1$);

$$H = -\frac{d^2}{dz^2} + V(iz), \quad (3)$$

where z is complex. In association with this process, the quantization condition $\psi \rightarrow 0$ as $|z| \rightarrow \infty$ is applied [15]. This quantization condition selects specific regions from the whole complex plane called Stokes wedges [16]. According to the lore of studying a non-Hermitian theory, one has to investigate the eigen value problem on a contour within these Stokes wedges. However, in investigating the ix^3 theory on the real line, which lies within the Stokes wedges of the theory, and although the quantization condition has been applied one can find existing infinities in calculating the transition amplitudes even in the quantum mechanical case [17]. These infinities found in the Feynman diagrams of the theory are a manifestation of the non-square integrability of the theory. In fact, for a theory to be square integrable, the integral $\int \psi^* \phi dx$ should be finite. For non-Hermitian theories, the inner product takes the form; $\int \psi^* \eta \phi dx$, where η is the metric operator [18, 19]. So, even when the quantization condition is applied, the structure of the metric operator may drag the integrand $\int \psi^* \eta \phi dx$

into infinity. Accordingly, the Stokes wedges are better defined via the condition $\rho\psi \rightarrow 0$ ($\rho = \sqrt{\eta}$) in order to make sure that the theory is square integrable. According to this argument, the ix^3 may not be a square integrable theory. On the other hand, one can find an example for which one can choose a contour that makes the quantization condition $\psi \rightarrow 0$ as $|z| \rightarrow \infty$ violated but the theory is still square integrable. It is the example for the potential ipx which has (on the real line) the Hermite polynomials as eigen functions. The Hermite polynomials do not go to zero as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Since x is real and as the wave functions do vanish at infinity, the real x lies outside the Stokes wedges of the theory. However, the theory is square integrable if we employ the metric $\eta = \exp(-x^2)$. From these two examples, it seems that one can work within the Stokes wedges and get non-square integrable theory and can work outside the Stokes wedges and get square integrable one. Accordingly, it would be more illustrative to find a link between the analytic continuation of the eigen value problem into the complex plane and the language of quantum mechanics for better understanding of what constraints have to be imposed on the chosen contours.

The link between the analytic continuation of the eigen value problem in Eq.(1) into the complex plane and its counterpart in Quantum mechanics can be achieved by noting that the transformation $x \rightarrow z(x)$ preserves the relation between the variable x and its differential operator, or;

$$\left[x, \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right] = \left[z, \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] = -1, \quad (4)$$

where $[A, B]$ is the commutator of the two operators A and B . Equivalently, one can rewrite this relation as;

$$[x, p_x] = [z, p_z] = i. \quad (5)$$

Thus the analytic continuation process is equivalent to only one type of the four different canonical transformations available for classical as well as quantum theories. In fact, the transformation $x \rightarrow z(x)$ resembles a point canonical transformation. So, the analytic continuation process resembles only a limited class of canonical transformations that one may use to obtain an equivalent Hamiltonian for the Non-Hermitian theory under consideration. Being equivalent to a one type of canonical transformations, one may wonder why a theory will select only canonical transformations represented by contours within the Stokes wedges? In this work, we try to answer this question and to assert that in sticking to contours within the Stokes wedges we narrow the size of available ways to investigate a specific theory.

To illustrate our idea of possible working on a contour outside the Stokes wedges, let us consider the transition amplitudes $\langle \chi_j | \eta_{C_1} | \chi_i \rangle$ where χ_j are the eigen functions of the Hamiltonian operator on a complex contour C_1 that lies inside the Stokes wedges of the theory. Then we assume that there exists another contour C_2 which is outside the Stokes wedges of the theory. If there exist a transformation ζ that maps C_1 to C_2 such that; $C_2 = \zeta C_1 \zeta^{-1}$, then the Hamiltonian H_{C_1} transforms as,

$$H_{C_2} = \zeta H_{C_1} \zeta^{-1},$$

and the eigen functions of H_{C_2} will be $\zeta \chi_j$ since

$$H_{C_2} (\zeta \chi_j) = \zeta H_{C_1} \chi_j = \lambda_j (\zeta \chi_j). \quad (6)$$

If we call the eigen functions of H_{C_2} as $\phi_j = \zeta \chi_j$, then the transition amplitudes can be rewritten in the form;

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \chi_j | \eta_{C_1} | \chi_i \rangle &= \langle \zeta^{-1} \phi_j | \eta_{C_1} | \zeta^{-1} \phi_i \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi_j | (\zeta^{-1})^\dagger \eta_{C_1} \zeta^{-1} | \phi_i \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Thus, the metric associated with the contour C_2 will have the form;

$$\eta_{C_2} = (\zeta^{-1})^\dagger \eta_{C_1} \zeta^{-1}. \quad (8)$$

Accordingly, if the theory is square integrable on C_1 it is also square integrable on C_2 with respect to another metric $\eta_{C_2} = (\zeta^{-1})^\dagger \eta_{C_1} \zeta^{-1}$ although the wave functions ϕ_j do not satisfy the quantization condition $\phi \rightarrow 0$ as $|z| \rightarrow 0$. The importance of this understanding is that one can choose a contour outside the Stokes wedges to treat the theory with the physical quantities stay the same. Since the calculational techniques that employ the Heisenberg picture for the operators know about the metric, one can choose a simple complex contour even if it exists outside the Stokes wedges with the end results stay the same. This trend is very important to the higher dimensional cases (quantum field theory) for which one can choose contours that avoid complications associated with contours within the Stokes wedges [20].

To elucidate our idea, let us consider the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian of the form;

$$H = p^2 - g (-ix)^n, \quad (9)$$

where g is the coupling constant. In applying the point canonical transformation of the form $x \rightarrow z(x)$ we get;

$$H \rightarrow H_1 = p_z^2 - g(iz(x))^n. \quad (10)$$

Note that, any contour in the complex plane will be a function of the form $z(x)$ which leads to $p_z = \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p_x$. Thus the equivalent Hamiltonian will take the form,

$$H_1 = \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p - g(iz(x))^n. \quad (11)$$

One can easily show that;

$$\left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p = \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p^2 - i \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p. \quad (12)$$

Accordingly, one can write the Hamiltonian H_1 as;

$$H_1 = \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p^2 - i \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} p - g(iz(x))^n. \quad (13)$$

As a differential operator, one can rewrite it in the form;

$$H_1 = s(x) \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + q(x) \frac{d}{dx} + r(x),$$

where

$$s(x) = - \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1}, \quad q(x) = - \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1}, \quad (14)$$

$$r(x) = -g(iz(x))^n.$$

If we constrain the complex contour represented by the function $z(x)$ such that the term $r(x)$ is real, one can rewrite the operator H_1 in a self adjoint form by rewriting the operator T ;

$$T = - \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \frac{d}{dx}, \quad (15)$$

in a self adjoint form by using a weight function $W(x) = c \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x}\right)^{-2} \exp\left(\int \frac{q(x)}{s(x)} dx\right)$ such that the eigen functions are orthogonal with respect to $W(x)$ [21]. In fact, the weight function $W(x)$ in orthogonal polynomial studies is equivalent to the metric operator $\eta(x)$ in Pseudo-Hermitian studies. Note that, in terms of $W(x)$, one can rewrite the eigen value problem associated with the Hamiltonian operator H_1 as;

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(s(x)W(x) \frac{d\psi(x)}{dx} \right) + r(x)W(x)\psi(x) = EW(x)\psi(x), \quad (16)$$

where E is the eigen value and $\psi(x)$ is the eigen function. The form in Eq.(16) is self adjoint provided that $W(x)$ satisfies the differential equation;

$$\frac{d}{dx} (s(x)W(x)) - q(x)W(x) = 0, \quad (17)$$

which defines the weight function $W(x)$. In this equation, the weight function $W(x)$ is governed by the functions $q(x)$ and $s(x)$ in the operator T . These functions are obtained from the transformation of the kinetic term of the original Hamiltonian. This means that applying the above method directly will be useless as the interaction part in the original Hamiltonian does not play a role in determining the weight function $W(x)$. However, one can Fourier transform the obtained eigen value problem to get another one for which the $q(x)$ and $s(x)$ functions will involve the interaction term in the original Hamiltonian.

As an application of the algorithm discussed above, consider the $(-x^4)$ Hamiltonian;

$$H = p^2 - g(ix)^4. \quad (18)$$

Let us select a simple complex contour $z(x)$ of the form $z(x) = \sqrt{\frac{ix}{\sqrt{g}}}$ which we have chosen to be out of the Stokes wedges. The Stokes wedges of the $-x^4$ theory are known to be totally in the lower half complex plane [16] while our contour lies in the upper half complex plane. In applying this transformation, the Hamiltonian takes the form;

$$H_1 = \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} p^2 - i \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial z(x)}{\partial x} \right)^{-1} p - g(iz(x))^4 \quad (19)$$

with $z(x) = \sqrt{\frac{ix}{\sqrt{g}}}$. Accordingly, we get,

$$H_1 = -4i\sqrt{g}p^2x + 6\sqrt{g}p + x^2. \quad (20)$$

A canonical transformation of the type $p \rightarrow x, x \rightarrow -p$, results in;

$$H_2 = 4i\sqrt{g}x^2p + 6\sqrt{g}x + p^2. \quad (21)$$

which can be rewritten in the form;

$$H_2 = s(x)\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + q(x)\frac{d}{dx} + r(x), \quad (22)$$

$$s(x) = -1, q(x) = 4\sqrt{g}x^2 \text{ and } r(x) = 6\sqrt{g}x. \quad (23)$$

Then the weight function can be obtained as;

$$\begin{aligned} W(x) &= -c \exp \left(\int -4\sqrt{g}x^2 dx \right) \\ &= -ce^{-\frac{4}{3}\sqrt{g}x^3} \\ &= e^{-\frac{4}{3}\sqrt{g}x^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where we have chosen $c = -1$ to make $W(x)$ real and positive.

Note that, one can obtain an equivalent Hermitian Hamiltonian with a weight function equal to one (i.e. Hermitian in the Dirac sense) via,

$$h = \rho H_2 \rho^{-1} = p^2 + 4gx^4 + 2\sqrt{g}x, \quad (25)$$

where $\rho = \sqrt{\eta}$, with η is metric operator which is equivalent to the weight function $W(x)$. This is exactly the same Hermitian Hamiltonian obtained in Ref.[16] except that the anomaly term (linear term in x) has opposite sign. It is easy to see that a canonical transformation of the form $x \rightarrow -x$ and $p \rightarrow -p$ will map our result to exactly the result in Ref. [16].

It is very important to realize that the analytic continuation of the eigen value problem into the complex plane is equivalent to a point canonical transformation. In view of our work above, the metric operator will thus depend on the contour chosen. As we are free now to choose any complex contour even if it is existing outside the Stokes wedges, a simple one like a transformation of the form $x \rightarrow x+c$, will be very appropriate to use in in higher dimensional problems (quantum field theory). In fact, it has been shown in Refs.[22, 25] that certain calculational techniques can implicitly incorporate the metric and thus no need to care about it in using these tools. Accordingly, for quantum field theories one can choose a simple contour out of the Stokes wedges and thus avoids problematic Jacobian factors resulted from working on contours within the Stokes wedges [20]. Besides, a field theoretic tool like the effective action formalism will save a great effort for the metric operator calculations.

To shed light on how it is very important to have the freedom to choose contours out of the stokes wedges in quantum field theories, let us consider the quantum field Hamiltonian density of the form;

$$H(x) = \frac{1}{2} ((\nabla\phi(x))^2 + \pi^2(x)) + \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2(x) - g\phi^4(x), \quad (26)$$

where $\phi(x)$ is the field variable, $\pi(x)$ is the canonical conjugate momentum field and g is the coupling constant. We choose a contour of the form $\phi \rightarrow \phi + v$, with v might be imaginary number, which is in fact a canonical transformation since it preserves the canonical commutation relations of the form;

$$[\phi(x), \pi(y)] = i\delta^{d-1}(x-y), \quad [\phi(x), \phi(y)] = [\pi(x), \pi(y)] = 0. \quad (27)$$

This transformation leads to a Hamiltonian of the form;

$$H(x) \rightarrow H_1 = \frac{1}{2} ((\nabla\phi(x))^2 + \pi^2(x)) + \frac{1}{2}m^2 (\phi(x) + v)^2 - g(\phi(x) + v)^4. \quad (28)$$

The associated Lagrangian density can easily obtained as;

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m^2 (\phi(x) + v)^2 + g(\phi(x) + v)^4 \quad (29)$$

In the path integral formulation, the generating Functional in the presence of an external source J is given by [24];

$$Z(J) = \int D\phi \exp \left([i \int d^d x \mathcal{L}(\phi) + J\phi] \right),$$

from which the effective action Γ is obtained via a Legendre transform such that,

$$\Gamma(v) = -i \log Z(J) - \int d^d y J(y) v(y),$$

where $v(y) = \langle \Omega | \phi(y) | \Omega \rangle$ is the vacuum condensate which we assume it position independent and $|\Omega\rangle$ resembles the vacuum state of the theory described by the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}(\phi)$. In our case, the canonical transformation $\phi(x) \rightarrow \phi(x) + v$ in the Hamiltonian formulation of the theory leaded to the Lagrangian density given by $\mathcal{L}(\phi) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\phi + v)$. One can expand $\mathcal{L}(\phi + v)$ around v to get;

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^d x (\mathcal{L}(\phi) + J\phi) &= \int d^d x (\mathcal{L}(v) + Jv) + \int d^d x \phi(x) \left(\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\phi)}{\partial \phi} \right)_{\phi=v} + J \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int d^d x d^d y \phi(x) \phi(y) \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2} \right)_{\phi=v} \\ &+ \frac{1}{3!} \int d^d x d^d y d^d z \phi(x) \phi(y) \phi(z) \left(\frac{\partial^3 \mathcal{L}(\phi)}{\partial \phi^3} \right)_{\phi=v} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

If one discards possible infinities that appears in the calculations of the amplitudes in space-time dimensions greater than 1 (no counter terms added), one can get the effective action as;

$$\Gamma(v) = \int d^d x \mathcal{L}(v) + \frac{i}{2} \log \det \left[\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2} \right) \right] - i (\text{ connected diagrams}),$$

where the vertices of the Feynman diagrams are taken to be $\left(\frac{\partial^n \mathcal{L}(\phi)}{\partial \phi^n} \right)_{\phi(x)=v}$. Since the vacuum condensate v has been taken to be position independent, one can introduce the effective potential in the form;;

$$V_{eff} = -\frac{\Gamma(v)}{VT},$$

where VT is the size of the space-time. The effective action is thus;

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(v) &= \int \mathcal{L}(v) dx^4 - \frac{i}{2} \log \det \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}(\phi)}{\partial \phi^2} \right) - i (\text{ connected diagrams}) \\ (-VT) V_{eff} &= \left(\frac{m^2}{2} v^2 - gv^4 \right) (-VT) - \frac{i}{2} \log \det (\partial^2 - 12v^2 + m^2) \\ &\quad - i (\text{ connected diagrams}) \\ &= \left(\frac{m^2}{2} v^2 - gv^4 \right) (-VT) - \frac{i}{2} Tr \det (\partial^2 - 12v^2 + m^2) \\ &\quad - i (\text{ connected diagrams}). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The one loop contribution to the effective action can be calculated by noting that;

$$Tr \det (\partial^2 - 12v^2 + m^2) = VT (-i) \frac{\Gamma(-\frac{d}{2})}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} (-12v^2 + m^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}, \tag{32}$$

where d is the space-time dimensions. In keeping terms of order $\hbar$ (one loop) we get,

$$V_{eff} = \frac{m^2}{2} v^2 - gv^4 + i \frac{\Gamma(-\frac{d}{2})}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} (-12v^2 + m^2)^{\frac{d}{2}}. \tag{33}$$

In $0 + 1$ space-time dimensions, the effective potential is then given by,

$$V_{eff} = \frac{m^2}{2} v^2 - gv^4 + \frac{1}{2} M, \tag{34}$$

where M is defined as;

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_0}{\partial v^2} = M^2, \quad V_0 = \frac{m^2}{2} v^2 - gv^4. \tag{35}$$

The effective action and thus the effective potential are constrained by successive differential relations. In fact, the effective action is the generating functional of the one-particle irreducible amplitudes [24]. For instance, when we set the source to zero we get the condition;

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma(v)}{\partial v} = 0, \text{ or equivalently } \frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial v} = 0.$$

This leads to the equation;

$$m^2 v - 4gv^3 - \frac{6gv}{M} = 0, \quad (36)$$

where we used the relation $M^2 = \frac{\partial^2 V_0}{\partial v^2} = m^2 - 12gv^2$. This equation is exactly the result obtained in Ref.[22]. Another relation that the effective action satisfies is that

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Gamma(v)}{\partial v^2} = iD^{-1},$$

where D is the propagator in the position space. In momentum space, the propagator is $\frac{-i}{M^2}$ (zero momentum because v is position independent) and in dividing by the size of the space-time , the above equation takes the form;

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}}{\partial v^2} = M^2,$$

which incorporates the one loop correction to the mass M calculated before from the classical potential $V_0 = \frac{m^2}{2}v^2 - gv^4$. To get the new M , we partially differentiate the equation in (36) with respect to v to get;

$$\begin{aligned} M^2 &= m^2 - 12gv^2 - 6g \frac{m^2}{M^3} \\ &= m^2 - 12gv^2 - \frac{6g}{M} - \frac{72g^2 v^2}{M^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

which up to first order in g is equivalent to Eq.(41) in Ref.[22]. So our calculations of the one loop effective potential can even go beyond the results obtained in Ref. [22] although their calculations have been obtained from Dyason-Schwinger equations truncated at the two-point function and treated on a contour within the Stokes wedges of the theory. In our calculations, the contour $\phi + v$ (ϕ resembles x in the $0 + 1$ space-time dimensions and v is imaginary) can exist in the upper half complex plane (out of the Stokes wedges) for positive imaginary v . In fact, Eqs. (36 & 37) predicts both positive as well as negative imaginary values [22] for the condensate but physical quantities like the vacuum energy or the Higgs mass do not differentiate between positive or negative imaginary condensates in our calculations. Being blind to the sign of the condensate, physical quantities can be calculated outside the Stokes wedges of the theory as we expected.

For more tests of our results, let us consider the two loops contributions to the effective potential. Up to two loops and in d space-time dimensions, we do have the one vertex diagram which gives,

$$\Delta_c = i \frac{(-24ig)}{8} \left(\frac{1}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \Gamma \left(1 - \frac{d}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{-M^2} \right)^{1-\frac{d}{2}} \right)^2, \quad (38)$$

and the sunset diagram which contributes,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_s &= i^3 \frac{(-1)^3 i \Gamma \left(3 - \frac{d}{2} \right)}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}} \Gamma(3)} \frac{(-1)^{3-\frac{d}{2}} i \Gamma \left(3 - \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2} \right)}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}} \Gamma \left(3 - \frac{d}{2} \right)} 2 \frac{(-24igv)^2}{12i} (m^2 - 12gv^2)^{-6+2d} I, \\ I &= \int_0^1 dx \int_0^1 dy (x^2 + xy - x + y^2 - y)^{-\frac{1}{2}d}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

So,

$$V_{eff} = \frac{m^2}{2} v^2 - gv^4 + i \frac{\Gamma \left(-\frac{d}{2} \right)}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} (-12v^2 + m^2)^{\frac{d}{2}} + \Delta_c + \Delta_s. \quad (40)$$

This form of the effective potential is divergent in space-time dimensions greater than one and in these cases one has to resort to the renormalization process to deal with such cases, which is out of the scope of the current work. Since our aim is test our results, we consider only the space-time dimensions $d = 0 + 1$ (quantum mechanics) for which one can find calculations for the vacuum energy in the literature. In $d = 1$ space-time dimension, the effective potential takes the form;

$$V_{eff} = \left(\frac{m^2}{2} v^2 - gv^4 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{m^2 - 12gv^2} - \frac{3}{4} \frac{g}{m^2 - 12gv^2} - 4v^2 \frac{g^2}{(m^2 - 12gv^2)^2}. \quad (41)$$

The stability condition $\frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial v} = 0$, results in;

$$-\frac{1}{72v^3} \left(288gv^6 - 72\sqrt{3}v^2\sqrt{-gv^2} + 5 \right) = 0, \quad (42)$$

which for $m = 0$ and for $g = \frac{1}{2}$ gives $v = \pm 0.87268i$, $M = \sqrt{\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}}{\partial v^2}} = 2.2201$ and the vacuum energy $V_{eff} = 0.73322$. These quantities have been calculated numerically in Ref.[22] (See Eqs. (14) & (25) and noting that our $g = \frac{1}{2}$ is equivalent to their $\lambda = 1$ and our V_{eff} is then $\frac{1}{2}E_0$) using the equivalent Hermitian theory. The error in the vacuum energy for instance is 7.25×10^{-3} , for the condensate it is 4.2348×10^{-3} and for M is 1.9×10^{-2} . These tiny errors between our two loop calculations for the effective potential and

the numerical calculations in the Hermitian form of the theory reflects the success of our expectations that one can work outside the Stokes wedges of the theory.

To conclude, we show that one can work on a complex contour outside the Stokes wedges of a given non-Hermitian theory while the transition amplitudes stay finite. Regarding this, we realize that working on a complex contour is equivalent to the famous canonical point transformation. Since the only constraint to be satisfied by a canonical transformation is to be isometric, then one can work either within or out of the Stokes wedges of the theory. The isometric property or the physical equivalence is simply to get the same value of a transition amplitude whatever the contour chosen. However, the metric operator will depend on the contour chosen in such a way that make the physical amplitudes to be the same for every possible contour. To illustrate our idea, we considered the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric x^4 theory for which we have chosen the contour $\sqrt{ix}$ which is well known to be out of the Stokes wedges. Surprisingly, we were able to get the same equivalent Hermitian Hamiltonian obtained before in the literature via the treatment of the theory on a contour within the Stokes wedges [16]. This is a very important result as one can feel free to choose complex contours that turn out the calculations simpler. For instance, sticking to a contour within the Stokes wedges of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric ϕ^4 scalar field theory led to problematic Jacobian factor [20]. To show how it is simple and successful to be free to choose contours outside the Stokes wedges of the theory, we chose a very simple complex contour of the form $\phi \rightarrow \phi + v$ which turns the calculations almost similar to the effective potential calculations known in the literature for Hermitian field theories. Although the metric operator associated with this contour is still hard to get in higher dimensions, the effective action algorithm we used in our calculations employs the Heisenberg picture of the operators and thus according to Refs.[22, 25] it knows about the metric. To check this, we calculated the effective potential of the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric ϕ^4 up to two loops and find amazing accurate values for the vacuum energy, the Higgs mass and the vacuum condensates compared to the numerical calculation of the same quantities obtained from the equivalent Hermitian theory. Also, we find that our results do not differentiate between positive imaginary condensate and negative imaginary condensate. In fact, positive imaginary condensate resembles a complex contour that lies on the upper half complex plane and thus lies outside the Stokes wedges of the theory. In the literature, it is always reported that the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric ϕ^4 field theory has a negative imaginary vacuum condensate but this result exists because of the constraint to work only

in the lower half complex plane while we have shown that physical quantities are the same for two different contours one in the upper half and one in the lower half complex plane. Accordingly, the vacuum condensate of the theory can be positive or negative imaginary value for the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric ϕ^4 , which is a new understanding of the theory to be presented here for the first time. Also, the simple contour we chose in this work turn out the calculation in the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric quantum field theory more simpler than sticking to contours within the Stokes wedges. The results of our work here will certainly lead to the possible study of more complicated $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric field theories since one can now choose simple contours with no need to calculate the metric operator.

-
- [1] Abouzeid M. Shalaby and Suleiman S. Al-Thoyaib, Phys. Rev. D 82, 085013 (2010).
 - [2] Abouzeid Shalaby, Phys.Rev.D 79, 065017 (2009).
 - [3] Carl M. Bender and Philip D. Mannheim, Phys.Rev.Lett.100:110402 (2008).
 - [4] Carl M. Bender, Sebastian F. Brandt, Jun-Hua Chen and Qinghai Wang, Phys.Rev. D71, 025014 (2005).
 - [5] C. M. Bender, K. A. Milton, and V. M. Savage, Phys. Rev. D 62, 85001 (2000).
 - [6] Frieder Kleefeld, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39 L9–L15 (2006).
 - [7] Abouzeid shalaby, Phys.Rev.D76:041702 (2007).
 - [8] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 251601 (2004); Phys. Rev. D70, 025001 (2004).
 - [9] Eric S. Swanson, AIP Conf.Proc.1296:75-121 (2010).
 - [10] H.F. Jones and R.J. Rivers, Phys.Rev.D74:125022 (2006).
 - [11] Carl M. Bender, Dorje C. Brody, Hugh F. Jones and Bernhard K. Meister, Phys.Rev.Lett.98:040403 (2007).
 - [12] Abouzeid M. Shalaby, Phys.Rev.D 80:025006 (2009).
 - [13] Carl M. Bender and Philip D. Mannheim, Phys.Rev.Lett.100:110402(2008).
 - [14] Carl M. Bender, Sebastian F. Brandt, Jun-Hua Chen, Qing-hai Wang, Phys.Rev.D71:025014 (2005).
 - [15] Carl Bender and Stefan Boettcher, Phys.Rev.Lett.80:5243-5246 (1998); Carl Bender, Stefan Boettcher and Peter N. Meisinger, J. Math. Phys. 40 (1999).

- [16] H. F. Jones and J. Mateo, Phys.Rev.D73:085002 (2006).
- [17] Carl M. Bender, Jun-Hua Chen, and Kimball A. Milton, J.Phys.A39:1657-1668 (2006).
- [18] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys., 43, 3944 (2002).
- [19] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. 43, 205 (2002).
- [20] Carl M. Bender, Dorje C. Brody, Jun-Hua Chen, Hugh F. Jones, Kimball A. Milton, and Michael C. Ogilvie1, Phys.Rev. D 74, 025016 (2006).
- [21] David Gomez-Ullate, Niky Kamran and Robert Milson, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 359, 352-367 (2009).
- [22] H.F. Jones, Int. J. Theor Phys, 50: 1071–1080 ((2011).
- [23] Carl M. Bender, Peter N. Meisinger, and Haitang Yang, Phys.Rev. D63, 045001(2001).
- [24] Michael E. Peskin and Daniel V.Schroeder, An Introduction To Quantum Field Theory (Addison-Wesley Advanced Book Program) (1995).
- [25] H.F. Jones and R.J. Rivers, Phys. Let. A 373, 3304-3308 (2009).